

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/259,762 03/01/99 YIN

Z 303.531US1

021186 MMC2/0802  
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH  
P.O. BOX 2938  
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

EXAMINER

DIAZ, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2815

DATE MAILED:

08/02/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/259,762

Applicant(s)

YIN ET AL.

Examiner

José R. Díaz

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

➤ The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

➤ Claims 1-3, and 5-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (US Patent No. 6,143,666) in view of Puntambekar et al. (US Patent No. 5,714,037).

Regarding claim 1, Lin et al. teaches a plasma surface treatment method comprising: providing a semiconductor substrate (20) comprising a film (22) (See Figure 3); treating the film (22) in a vacuum of about 3.0-6.5 Torr (See column 9, line 10), for a time of about 10 seconds to about 5 minutes (See column 9, line 19), and in an

Art Unit: 2815

atmosphere comprising oxygen plasma (24) wherein the oxygen plasma flow rate is at least about 300 sccm oxygen (See column 9, lines 15-16) thereby rendering the substrate resistant to profile distortion to make a treated substrate (22') (See Figure 4); applying a resist (26) to the treated substrate (22'); and patterning the resist (26a, 26b, and 26c) (See Figure 5).

Regarding claim 2, Lin et al. teaches exposing oxygen gas to an energy source generating about 150-900 watts in order to make the oxygen plasma (See column 9, line 11).

Regarding claim 3, Lin et al. teaches that the oxygen plasma is made by electromagnetic excitation of oxygen gas by electrodes that are about 180-280 mils apart. Regarding the difference in the range of separation of the electrodes between the prior art and the application, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or working ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Regarding claim 5, Lin et al. teaches that the oxygen plasma is made by an exposure of oxygen gas to an energy source that is RF energy (See column 9, line 12).

Regarding claim 9, Lin et al. teaches removing the resist (48a, 48b, 48c) from the film (45') (See column 15, lines 25-28).

Regarding claim 10, Lin et al. teaches that the oxygen flow rate is not greater than about 2000 sccm (See column 9, lines 15-16).

Lin et al. do not teach treating a film comprising silicon nitride in an atmosphere comprised of oxygen plasma. Puntambekar et al. teaches that it is well known in the art to treat a silicon nitride film (16) in an atmosphere comprised of oxygen plasma (column 1, lines 46-50). Puntambekar et al. provide motivation to use such a step in that the adhesion between the silicon nitride film (16) and a polyimide film (18) is improved (See column 5, lines 12-15 and 21-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the same time the invention was made to have modified Lin et al. to include treating a film comprising silicon nitride in an atmosphere comprised of oxygen plasma as taught by Puntambekar et al. since such modification would result in improved adhesion between the silicon nitride film and the polyimide film, as described in column 5, lines 12-15 and 21-24 of Puntambekar et al.

Furthermore, Lin et al. do not teach adding an inert gas to the oxygen gas. Regarding claim 11, Puntambekar et al. teaches that it is well known in the art to add argon to the oxygen gas (column 5, line 20). Puntambekar et al. provide motivation to use such a gas in that the argon ions make the surface of the silicon nitride more susceptible to accepting the oxygen ions also contained in the plasma (See column 5, lines 16-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the same time the invention was made to have modified Lin et al. to include an inert gas as taught by Puntambekar et al. since such modification would result in a silicon nitride having surface more susceptible to accepting the oxygen ions also contained in the plasma, as described in column 5, lines 16-19 of Puntambekar et al.

Regarding claim 6, Official Notice is taken with respect to the limitation wherein the oxygen plasma is made by an exposure of oxygen gas to an energy source that is microwave energy since it is well known in the art that using microwave energy is an alternative method of forming an oxygen plasma (See for example Spencer et al. US Patent No. 4,673,456).

Official Notice is taken with respect to claims 7 and 8 since the method for treating a film in an atmosphere comprised of oxygen plasma disclosed by Lin et al. in view of Puntambekar et al. has the same parameters as disclosed by Applicant, and hence it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that such a method would result in the reduction of footing and undercutting, as claimed by Applicant.

### ***Response to Arguments***

➤ Applicant's arguments filed May 15, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine the references Puntambekar et al. and Lin et al. since the reference Lin et al. "teaches away from the claims of the present invention." The Examiner disagrees. The preferred embodiment of Lin et al. treats a silicon dioxide layer (22) with a plasma treatment as discussed previously in the rejection under 35 USC § 103. However, the reference Lin et al. does not limit the invention to only treat a silicon dioxide layer. For example, Lin et al. teach the step of performing a plasma treatment to an IMD layer (45) (see col. 13, lines 42-45), which is performed by "employing methods, materials and conditions analogous or equivalent to the methods, materials and conditions employed in forming

Art Unit: 2815

the first plasma 24 employed within the first preferred embodiment of the present invention" (see col. 13, lines 45-52). Regarding the IMD layer (45), Lin et al. teach that the IMD layer "may be formed through use of methods and materials as generally known in the art of integrated circuit microelectronics fabrication" (see col. 12, lines 54-56). Furthermore and as acknowledges by Applicant in the "Remarks", Lin et al. teach that such materials comprise silicon oxide dielectric materials, silicon nitride dielectric materials and silicon oxynitride dielectric materials (see col. 12, lines 1-5 and 57-61), which is consistent with the teaching of Puntambekar et al. that silicon nitride is a known material selected for layers to be treated by a plasma treating process (see Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103). Regarding the limitation of the oxygen plasma flowrate, Applicant is advised that Lin et al. teach such a limitation in column 9, lines 15-16 (see Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103). Therefore, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive in view of the remarks described above.

### ***Conclusion***

➤ **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of



the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José R. Díaz whose telephone number is (703) 308-6078. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 5:00 Monday through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie C. Lee can be reached on (703) 308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

JRD  
July 30, 2001



EDDIE LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800